

MEETING SUMMARY

Hatchery Scientific Review Group Harbor Room, WestCoast Silverdale Hotel, Silverdale, Washington May 23–25, 2000

Agenda: The purpose of this meeting was to continue development of the HSRG scientific framework; finalize HSRG policies and procedures; review a draft Report to Congress on hatchery reform; finalize an HSRG long-term work plan; tour the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Manchester facility; discuss the co-managers' hatchery reform management framework; and meet with the Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee.

In Attendance:

- HSRG members John Barr, Lee Blankenship (vice chair), Don Campton, Trevor Evelyn, Conrad Mahnken, Lars Mobrand (chair), Robert Piper, Lisa Seeb and Bill Smoker.
- Facilitation team members Barbara Cairns, Kathy Hopper, Michael Kern, BJ Mirk and Jim Waldo.
- The Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee met with the HSRG on May 25.

Discussions/Presentations:

Jim Waldo informed HSRG members that the April 20, 2000 Congressional field hearing on salmon recovery in Bellevue, Washington went very well. Feedback from attendees indicated that the panel on hatchery reform was considered one of the strongest. Panelists included Jim Waldo, Pete Bergman of NW Marine Technology, Billy Frank, Jr. of the NW Indian Fisheries Commission, Jeff Koenings of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Frank Urabeck of the NW Marine Trade Association.

Kathy Hopper reviewed a series of documents and references provided by the facilitation team to further develop the HSRG information base on hatcheries in Puget Sound and Coastal Washington.

Lars Mobrand led the HSRG through the latest draft of the scientific framework and discussed progress made since the April meeting. He explained that he had incorporated sections provided by HSRG members into a revised framework outline. He said that the goal for this meeting was to develop a draft version of the framework, including definitions and measurements, for inclusion in the Report to Congress. He suggested that since all four sections of the outline can be divided into genetic ("nature") and environmental ("nurture") components, HSRG members split into two breakout groups to flesh out these components, then report back and review each other's results.

The HSRG split into the two breakout groups to further develop the scientific framework. Lars Mobrand asked them to keep in mind that the purpose of the framework is to answer the following series of question: 1) What are the conditions under which a hatchery can be successful at helping to restore naturally spawning salmon and provide sustainable fisheries?; 2)

What sub-conditions exist under each condition?; 3) How can these sub-conditions be measured? The group spent most of day one, part of day two and much of day three working on the scientific framework.

The facilitation team presented a revised set of draft HSRG policies and procedures that spell out HSRG goals and objectives, appointment procedures and criteria, administrative procedures, conflict of interest guidelines, officers and other topics. The group reviewed the draft, requested a number of modifications and (after the facilitation team incorporated the modifications) adopted the policies and procedures.

As a result of the policies and procedures discussion, the HSRG revised its goal statement to read as follows: “The goal of the HSRG is to use the best available scientific information, based on logic and knowledge, for the purposes of repositioning hatcheries and implementing hatchery reform. Success in this effort means that the hatchery management agencies concur with the recommended actions and implement changes.”

Jim Waldo and BJ Mirk led the HSRG in consideration of a revised long-term work plan and timeline for developing and using the scientific framework. The group agreed that they intend to develop a scientific framework that 1) the co-managers can compare to their Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) for compliance with the Endangered Species Act; 2) would also guide the HSRG in reviewing co-manager plans at a programmatic level; and 3) would direct the HSRG’s long-term research program.

The HSRG agreed that once the scientific framework is developed, it should be refined, then expanded, tested “in-house” to see if it is working as intended, modified based on the results of that test, given to select individuals for informal review, modified based on the results of that review, sent out for formal review and a work session with the co-managers, then finalized and implemented. The group set June 7, 2000 as the target date for developing the expanded framework and October 31, 2000 for finalizing and implementing the framework. BJ Mirk and Lars Mobrand will propose dates for timeline elements between June 7 and October 31 for incorporation in the Congressional Report.

The HSRG agreed to the following set of agenda priorities through September 2000:

- Research—including an inventory of ongoing research and key research questions about current operations;
- The HatPro database—including presentations by the co-managers about the timeframe and work plan for this database and how to use it with the HSRG’s work;
- The scientific framework—ensuring that its development is on track and that it continues to be the central organizing tool for the HSRG.

The HSRG discussed the selection of a vice chair and agreed that the main roles of the vice chair included assisting the chair and conducting meetings in the chair’s absence. Lee Blankenship was elected vice chair by a unanimous vote.

Barbara Cairns provided the HSRG with an update on preparations for the joint HSRG and Long Live the Kings (LLTK) Report to Congress on Hatchery Reform, due June, 2000. Barbara

thanked the group for helping LLTK assemble and edit a draft report within a very tight timeframe. This initial draft can now be tightened up and finalized. Barbara asked the HSRG to pay particular attention to the HSRG section of the report, including discussion of the scientific framework and its uses. She said examples illustrating how the framework will work would also be helpful. The group reviewed the draft report and provided a number of suggested revisions. The facilitation team requested that any suggestions not presented at the meeting be provided by June 2, so that a final draft can go out on June 7. Comments on this draft need to be received by June 13, so that the final report can go to the printer on June 16 for presentation at a June 24 Congressional briefing, to be held in-state. Barbara encouraged HSRG members to attend the briefing.

The HSRG spent an afternoon touring the NMFS Manchester facility and receiving presentations from NMFS Manchester staff on relevant work.

On day three, the two breakout groups reported back on their discussions about the scientific framework. Individual HSRG members were assigned responsibility for assembling specific sections of the framework outline and sending them to Lars Mobrand. The following questions need to be addressed in each section: 1) What is it (the definition)?; 2) Why is it important?; 3) Can it be measured?; 4) Examples and citations (where possible). After these first four steps are completed, the fifth question is, "How can it be measured?" Lars will work with BJ Mirk to assemble the framework for inclusion in the Report to Congress.

Lars Mobrand reported that he and other HSRG members met with Jim Scott of WDFW several times since the April meeting to discuss the co-managers' hatchery reform management framework. Lars passed out a draft document containing a proposed risk/benefit assessment framework for artificial propagation. He indicated that this is still very much a work in progress. Lars said the co-managers see this as a near-term approach, while the scientific framework is developed. He believes it is best to continue interfacing with Jim Scott and the co-managers on this process and recommends that HSRG members read and comment on the document. John Barr explained that the tribes have so far not been present at the discussions, because the process is not yet at a stage of its development where the state is ready to present it to the tribes. The HSRG discussed the importance of this largely qualitative tool not being used quantitatively. They also noted that at this point, it addresses risks but not benefits.

The HSRG decided to hold its June 22–23, 2000 meeting in Olympia, Washington, assuming the Congressional briefing will follow in Tacoma, Washington on June 24, 2000. Topics on the June agenda will include HatPro, the scientific framework, research, accountability, harvest and preparation for the June 24 briefing.

The HSRG met with the Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee to provide a progress update and then spent the remainder of the meeting's final afternoon working on the scientific framework.